

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 9, 11, 12, 14-21 and 23-26 are pending in the Application and are now presented for examination. Claims 1, 16 and 21 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 16 and 21 are independent.

Patentability under 35 U.S.C. §102

On page 3 of the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 11, 12, 14, 16-18, 20, 21, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Koyanagi *et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0257436 A1). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Independent Claim 1 recites, among other things, “generate, from the buffered wide-angle image data, virtual view data representing a virtual view of a portion of the panoramic view.” Independent Claim 16 recites, among other things, “generating, from the buffered wide-angle image data, virtual view data using a virtual view transformation, the virtual view data representing a virtual view of a portion of the panoramic view.” Independent Claim 21 recites, among other things, “means for processing and generating, from the buffered wide-angle image data, virtual view data representing a virtual view of a portion of the panoramic view.” These features are not taught or suggested by Koyanagi.

According to one exemplary embodiment, the system of the claimed invention creates “signals indicative of a graphical user interface from wide-angle image data ... corresponding to a monitored area” (see Specification at paragraph [0007]). In one embodiment, the system requires, among other things, a processor configured to generate, from the buffered wide angle image data, both a panoramic view data of a panoramic view of the monitored area and a virtual

view data representing a virtual view of a portion of the panoramic view. In other words, the claimed invention, transforms a single captured image into both a panoramic view and a virtual view without having to recapture additional image data.

Koyanagi discloses using a wide-angle lens to generate a panoramic view upon demand when a user presses a panorama generation button (see Koyanagi at paragraph [0052]). Data captured from the wide-angle lens is transformed into a stationary panoramic view which is then displayed on a screen (see Koyanagi at paragraphs [0042]-[0043] and [0052]). However, the image displayed in the operation area 6A, i.e. the area the Office Action equates to the virtual view of the present invention (see page 4 of Office Action), is *not* generated from wide-angle data. Instead, the image is captured *directly from the pan tilter camera* by mechanically controlling the pan tilter camera (see Koyanagi at paragraphs [0042]-[0043] and Figure 1). The user operates the pan tilter camera by moving a cursor over the panoramic or operation area, causing the pan tilter to center the camera on the selected point (see Koyanagi at paragraph [0044]). Thus, the image displayed in the operation area is not a “virtual view” transformed from buffered wide angle data, but an actual view captured from the pan tilter camera.

Koyanagi is deficient at least because it fails to teach or suggest “generate, from the buffered wide-angle image data, virtual view data representing a virtual view of a portion of the panoramic view,” as recited in amended Claim 1; “generating, from the buffered wide-angle image data, virtual view data using a virtual view transformation, the virtual view data representing a virtual view of a portion of the panoramic view,” as recited in amended Claim 16; and “means for processing and generating, from the buffered wide-angle image data, virtual view

data representing a virtual view of a portion of the panoramic view,” as recited in amended Claim 21.

In view of the foregoing differences between independent Claims 1, 16 and 21 and the cited art, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable and the rejection to these claims be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, 23 and 26 depend directly or indirectly from one or another of independent Claims 1 and 16, discussed above. These claims recite additional features which, in conformity with the features of their corresponding independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested by the art or record. The dependent claims are therefore believed to be allowable. Nonetheless, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Patentability under 35 U.S.C. §103

On page 8 of the Office Action, Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyanagi *et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0257436 A1) in view of Monroe (U.S. Publication No. 2007/0182819 A1). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Dependent Claims 9 and 19 depend indirectly from one or another of independent Claims 1 and 16, discussed above. These claims recite additional features which, in conformity with the features of their corresponding independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested by the art or record. The dependent claims are therefore believed to be allowable. Nonetheless, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

On page 10 of the Office Action, Claims 5, 15, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Koyanagi *et al.* (U.S. Publication No: 2004/0257436 A1) in view of Poelstra (U.S. Patent No: 5,563,650 A1). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Dependent Claims 5, 15, 24 and 25 depend directly indirectly form one or another of independent Claims 1 and 16, discussed above. These claims recite additional features which, in conformity with the features of their corresponding independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested by the art or record. The dependent claims are therefore believed to be allowable. Nonetheless, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

For all of the above reasons, the claim objections are believed to have been overcome placing Claims 1-5, 9, 11, 12, 14-21 and 23-26 in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Of note, Applicant's undersigned representative is registered to practice before the United States Patent & Trademark Office. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.34 and M.P.E.P. § 405, the signature of Applicant's undersigned representative is representation that he is authorized to represent Applicant and the assignee on whose behalf he is acting.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

Application No: 10/802,451
Filed: March 17, 2004
Attorney Docket No: 1281-87U (C4-1207)

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit overpayments or charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No: 502104.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 16, 2009

By: /Alan M. Weisberg/
Alan M. Weisberg
Reg. No: 43,982
Attorney for Applicant
Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.
200 East Las Olas Boulevard, Suite 2040
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
Customer No: 70757
Tel: (954) 828-1488
Fax: (954) 828-9122
email: ptomail@cwiplaw.com

176159